generated from spread-spectrum processing a data-bit-sequence signal with a data-chip-sequence signal, <u>the pilot-chip-sequence signal and the data-chip-sequence signal being different from each other,</u> comprising the steps of:

generating a replica of the pilot-chip-sequence signal;

generating a replica of the data-chip-sequence signal;

generating, responsive to a peak-pilot correlation signal, a pilot-control signal;

programming said programmable-matched filter to set the first plurality of taps of said programmable-matched filter to have a programmable-impulse response matched to the pilot-chip-sequence signal;

despreading the pilot-spread-spectrum channel as a despread-pilot-bit-sequence signal, each bit of the despread-pilot-bit-sequence having a second plurality of chips, a number of the second plurality of chips being equal to a number of the first plurality of taps;

outputting, on the basis of one output for every second plurality of chips, the despread-pilot-bit-sequence signal to the frame-matched filter;

filtering, with said frame-matched filter having a frame-impulse response matched to the pilot-bit-sequence signal, the despread-pilot-bit-sequence signal, each of the second plurality of taps of said frame-matched filter for correlating with a respective bit of the despread-pilot-bit-sequence signal;

generating a peak-pilot-correlation signal in response

to a frame of the despread-pilot-bit-sequence signal matching the frame-impulse response of the frame-matched filter;

programming said programmable-matched filter, responsive to the peak-pilot-correlation signal, to have the programmable-impulse response matched to the data-chip-sequence signal; and

despreading the data-spread-spectrum channel as a despread-data-bit-sequence signal.

REMARKS

By this amendment applicant amends claim 7. Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to claim 7.

The informality noted by the Examiner has been corrected herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-33 and 9-14, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,855.

Applicant has prepared and enclosed herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) and (c), showing the necessary common ownership and thereby overcoming the rejection based on the non-statutory double patenting ground.

The pending claims being in condition for allowance, applicant solicits allowance of the pending claims.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of $110.00 pursuant to 37

40

-3-

41